



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,956	06/01/2001	Jian J Lu	PM-275378	4522

909 7590 05/07/2002
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

NICKOL, GARY B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2002

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,956

Applicant(s)

LU ET AL.

Examiner

Gary B. Nickol Ph.D.

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1.5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The response filed on February 25, 2002 (Paper No. 9) to the restriction requirement of January 23, 2002 has been received. Applicant has elected Group I, claims 1-6 for examination without traverse. Claims 7-9 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner under 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Thus, claims 1-6 are pending and are currently under examination.

Specification

The specification is objected to for the following reason: The specification on page 1 should be amended to reflect the priority status of the present application. It is noted that applicants have amended the specification to recite that this application is the national phase of international application PCT/GB99/01793 filed June 8, 1999. However, applicants should also include reference to priority under 35 USC 119/365 to international application 9812607.1, filed June 12, 1998.

The specification is further objected to because there does not appear to be an abstract of the disclosure.

Information Disclosure Statement

Reference JR of the IDS was not present. A courtesy copy of the reference has been placed in the application and henceforth was considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4, 6 are rejected as vague and indefinite for reciting the term DETH as the sole means of identifying the claimed molecule. The use of laboratory designations only to identify a particular molecule renders the claims indefinite because different laboratories may use the same laboratory designations to define completely distinct molecules. The rejection can be obviated by amending the claims to specifically and uniquely identify DETH, for example, by SEQ ID NO.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The written description in this case only sets forth SEQ ID NO:2 and therefore the written description is not commensurate in scope with the claims which read on allelic variants of SEQ ID NO. 2 such as amino acid sequences having at least 80, 90, 95 or 99% identity to DETH or various naturally occurring fragments of DETH.

Art Unit: 1642

Support for naturally occurring variants, that is allelic variants, is provided in the specification (page 4, lines 28-31 to page 5, lines 1-5) where it is disclosed that a variant of DETH may have an amino acid sequence that is different by one or more amino acid substitutions. The variant may also have conservative or non-conservative changes or may further have up to 5 amino acid insertions and or deletions. However, no disclosure, beyond the mere mention of potential DETH-like polypeptides and or variants is made in the specification.

Reiger et al. (Glossary of Genetics and Cytogenetics, Classical and Molecular, 4th Ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976) clearly define alleles as one of two or more alternative forms of a gene occupying the same locus on a particular chromosome..... and differing from other alleles of that locus at one or more mutational sites (page 17), which therefore encode allelic variant proteins. Thus, the structure of naturally occurring allelic sequences are not defined, nor in this case, is the structure of allelic variant proteins encoded by allelic variant genes defined. With the exception of SEQ ID NO:2, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed structure of the encompassed polypeptides and or encoded variants and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The amino acid sequence itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Lts.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016. Although these court findings are drawn to DNA art, the findings are clearly applicable to the claimed proteins.

Furthermore, although drawn to the DNA art, the findings of *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412) are clearly applicable to the instant

Art Unit: 1642

rejection. The court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of nucleic acids by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that while Applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of DNA molecules, usually defined by a nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states that “An adequate written description of a DNA...’requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties’, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention”. The instant disclosure, however, of a single species of nucleic acid and encoded polypeptide does not adequately describe the scope of the claimed genus, which encompasses a substantial variety of subgenera.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117). The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 115).

Therefore only a purified protein having an amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 meets the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Deen *et al.* (US Patent No. 6013476, April 2, 1997).

The claims are drawn to a purified protein having an amino acid sequence having at least 80% identity (Claim 1); or at least 90% identity (Claim 2); or at least 95% identity (Claim 3) or at least 99% identity to DETH (Claim 4) or purified protein of Claim 1 wherein said protein has the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 (Claim 5). The claims are further drawn to a fragment of DETH that induces apoptosis (Claim 6).

As evidenced by the specification on page 4, line 12; DETH is the novel protein of SEQ ID NO:2.

Deen *et al.* teach a purified protein having an amino acid sequence having 100% sequence similarity to DETH (see attached sequence comparison). Although the reference does not specifically teach that the purified peptide induces apoptosis, the claims are drawn to the product *per se* and inherently, such a polypeptide would induce apoptosis. Thus, the claimed peptide appears to be the same as the prior art. The office does not have the facilities and resources to provide the factual evidence needed in order to establish that the product of the prior art does not possess the same material, structural and functional characteristics of the claimed product. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the burden is on the applicant to prove that the claimed product is different from those taught by the prior art and to establish patentable differences. See *In re Best* 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *Ex parte Gray* 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary B. Nickol Ph.D. whose telephone number is 703-305-7143. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Application/Control Number: 09/733,956

Page 8

Art Unit: 1642

Gary B. Nickol, Ph.D.

Examiner

Art Unit 1642

GBN

May 6, 2002


ART UNIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600